

REMARKS

Claims 30, 31 and 34 have been amended, claims 37 to 39 have been added, claims 1 to 22 have been allowed and claims 23 to 29 were withheld from consideration and canceled. Claims 1 to 22 and 30 to 36 remain active in this application. Please charge any costs to Deposit Account No. 20-0668.

Claims 30, 31 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Stearns et al. (U.S. 6,160,705). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

In addition to the arguments previously presented, which are incorporated herein by reference, claim 30 requires, among other features, a plurality of signal lines, a plurality of first power lines coupleable to a first power source, and a plurality of second power lines coupleable to a second power source. No such structure is taught or suggested by Stearns et al.

Claim 30 further requires, all on the second surface, that at least one of the plurality of signal lines be disposed between a pair of the plurality of first power lines and that the signal lines between the pair of the plurality of first power lines and the pair of the plurality of first power lines be disposed between a pair of the second power lines. No such structure is taught or suggested by Stearns et al. Stearns power lines are all connected together.

Claims 31 and 33 depend from claim 30 and therefore define patentably over Stearns et al. for at least the reasons presented above with reference to claim 30.

In addition, claim 31 further limits claim 30 by requiring that the signal lines be of a first width, the first power lines be of a second width different from the first, and the second power lines be of a third width different from the first and second widths. No such structure is taught or suggested by Stearns et al. either alone or in the combination as claimed.

Claim 33 further limits claim 30 by requiring a ground plane on the first surface of the substrate. No such combination is taught or suggested by Stearns et al.

Claim 34 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nemoto et al. (U.S. 6,407,432) The rejection is respectfully traversed.

To begin with, Nemoto et al. does not appear to have been published in the English language prior to the filing date of provisional application 60/147,596 from which this application claims priority. Accordingly, Nemoto et al. is not available as a reference in this application.

In addition, claim 34 requires, among other features, a plurality of groups of lines including groups of lines of at least three different widths disposed on the second surface of the substrate, the groups of lines arranged such that one or more lines in a first group of lines of a first width are disposed between lines of a second group of lines of a second width and lines in a said second group of lines of said second width are disposed between lines of said third width. No such structure is taught or suggested by Nemoto et al. There is no discussion relative to Fig. 13a of Nemoto et al. about the width of the lines therein. Furthermore, at best, only two different widths of lines are shown in Nemoto et al. A line that has varying widths is not two or more lines of different widths.

Claim 34 further requires that the lines be arranged such that one or more lines in a first set of lines of a first width are disposed between lines of the second width and one or more lines in a second set of lines of the second width are disposed between lines of the third width. No such structure is taught or suggested by Nemoto et al. either alone or in the combination as claimed.

Claims 30 to 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kalidas et al. (U.S. 6,396,136). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Kalidas et al. bears a filing date and a provisional application filing date subsequent to the effective filing date of the subject application. In fact, the provisional filing date of the subject application is prior to that of Kalidas et al. and the filing date of the subject application is prior to that of Kalidas et al. It follows that Kalidas et al. is not available as a reference in this application.

Claim 34 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Link et al. (U.S. 5,055,704). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 34 requires, among other features, a plurality of groups of lines including groups of lines of at least three different widths disposed on the second surface of the substrate, the groups of lines arranged such that one or more lines in a first group of lines of a first width are disposed between lines of a second group of lines of a second width and lines in a said second group of lines of said second width are disposed between lines of said third width. No such structure is taught or suggested by Link et al. Clearly, Link et al. does not have groups of lines of the same width, let alone three such groups. The widths of the lines of Link et al. are nowhere stated and appear to be random.

Claim 36 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nemoto et al. in view of Cuvilliers et al. (U.S. 4,617,586). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 36 depends from claim 34 and therefore defines patentably over the applied references for at least the reasons presented above with reference to claim 34 since Cuvilliers et al. fails to overcome the deficiencies in Nemoto et al. as noted above.

In addition, claim 36 further requires a ground plane on the first surface of the substrate. No such combination is taught or suggested by Nemoto et al, Cuvilliers et al. or any proper combination of these references.

Claims 37 to 39 are patterned after claims 30 to 32 except that the second and third groups of lines are coupled to a different power supply. No such feature is taught or suggested by the cited references either alone or in the combination as claimed.

In view of the above remarks, favorable reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jay M. Cantor", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Jay M. Cantor
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 19,906

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P. O. Box 655474, MS 3999
Dallas, Texas 75265
(301) 424-0355 (Phone)
(972) 917-5293 (Phone)
(301) 279-0038 (Fax)